

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION

ERIK GARCIA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION
vs.	)	
	)	FILE No.
SHORQ STAR, INC. and	)	
ANTHEM PROP, LLC,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**COMPLAINT**

COMES NOW, ERIK GARCIA, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, his Complaint against Defendants SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

**JURISDICTION**

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendants’ failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

**PARTIES**

2. Plaintiff ERIK GARCIA (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is, and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in Houston, Texas (Harris County).

3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.

4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking and standing.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. Plaintiff is also an independent advocate of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of enforcing Plaintiff’s civil rights, monitoring, determining and ensuring whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. His motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make Plaintiff’s community more accessible for Plaintiff and others; and pledges to do whatever is necessary to create the requisite standing to confer jurisdiction upon this Court so an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on this property, including returning to the Property as soon as it is accessible (“Advocacy Purposes”).

7. Defendant, SHORQ STAR, INC. (hereinafter “SHORQ STAR, INC.”), is a Texas company that transacts business in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

8. Defendant, SHORQ STAR, INC., may be properly served with process via its registered agent for service, to wit: Mohanad M. Zaben, Registered Agent, 8550 Winkler Drive, Suite C, Houston, TX 77017.

9. Defendant, ANTHEM PROP, LLC (hereinafter “ANTHEM PROP, LLC”), is a Texas limited liability company that transacts business in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

10. Defendant, ANTHEM PROP, LLC, may be properly served with process via its registered agent for service, to wit: Fat Property, LLC, Registered Agent, Lutsch Cody, 3800 Garrott Street, Houston, TX 77006.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

11. On or about December 22, 2019, Plaintiff was a customer at “Super Mercado” a business located at 8550 Winkler Drive, Houston, TX 77017, referenced herein as “Super Mercado”.

12. Super Mercado is operated by Defendant, SHORQ STAR, INC.

13. Defendant, SHORQ STAR, INC., is the lessee or sub-lessee of the real property and improvements that are the subject of this action and operates Super Mercado.

14. ANTHEM PROP, LLC is the owner or co-owner of the real property and improvements that Super Mercado is situated upon and that is the subject of this action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

15. Plaintiff lives 13 miles from Super Mercado and the Property.

16. Plaintiff’s access to the business(es) located at 8550 Winkler Drive, Houston, TX 77017, Harris County Property Appraiser’s account number 0402020000031 (“the Property”), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendant, SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC, are compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at Super Mercado and the Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

17. Plaintiff has visited Super Mercado and the Property at least once before as a customer and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends on revisiting Super Mercado and the Property within six months or sooner, as soon as the barriers to access detailed in this Complaint are removed and Super Mercado and the Property is accessible again. The purpose of the revisit

is to be a regular customer, to determine if and when Super Mercado and the Property is made accessible and to maintain standing for this lawsuit for Advocacy Purposes.

18. Plaintiff intends on revisiting Super Mercado and the Property to purchase goods and/or services as a regular customer living in the near vicinity as well as for Advocacy Purposes, but does not intend to re-expose himself to the ongoing barriers to access and engage in a futile gesture of visiting the public accommodation known to Plaintiff to have numerous and continuing barriers to access.

19. Plaintiff travelled to Super Mercado and the Property as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, encountered the barriers to access at Super Mercado and the Property that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged those barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury as a result of the illegal barriers to access present at the Super Mercado and the Property.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG**

20. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

21. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;
- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;

- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and
- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

- 22. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:
  - (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
  - (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and
  - \* \* \* \* \*
  - (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

23. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

24. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

25. Super Mercado is a public accommodations and service establishment.

26. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

27. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

28. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

29. Super Mercado must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

30. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

31. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed Super Mercado and the Property in his capacity as a customer of Super Mercado and the Property as well as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at Super Mercado and the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to Super Mercado and the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

32. Plaintiff intends to visit Super Mercado and the Property again in the very near future as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at Super Mercado and the Property, but will be unable to fully do so because of his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at Super Mercado and the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to Super Mercado and the

Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

33. Defendants, SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC, have discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying his access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of Super Mercado and the Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

34. Defendants, SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC, will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendants, SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC, are compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at Super Mercado and the Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make Super Mercado and the Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

35. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed, or was made aware of prior to the filing of this Complaint, that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to Super Mercado and the Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of Super Mercado and the Property include, but are not limited to:

**ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:**

- (i) There are changes in level at Property exceeding ½ (one-half) inch that are not properly ramped in violation of Section 303.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.

Specifically, due to the presence of a raised metal bar on the floor surface blocking all accessible routes to the entrance, there is an approximately 2 (two) inch vertical rise prior to the entrance, thus rendering the interior of the Property inaccessible. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

- (ii) The maneuvering clearance of the accessible entrance is not level in violation of Section 404.2.4.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (iii) Due to the accessible barrier present at the accessible entrance, the accessible entrance of the Property lacks at least one accessible route provided within the site to the public streets and sidewalks in violation of Section 206.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- (iv) The Property lacks signage identified by the International Symbol of Accessibility that indicates the location of the nearest entrance complying with Section 404 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, if such an entrance exists. This policy decision by Defendant(s) violates Section 216.6 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to find an accessible entrance.
- (v) There is not at least one accessible entrance to each tenant space in the building that complies with Section 404 of the 2010 ADAAG standards which is a violation of Section 206.4.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards.
- (vi) The accessible parking space is missing a proper identification sign in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.

- (vii) The access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (viii) The accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of Section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation made it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.
- (ix) There is an excessive vertical rise at the base of the accessible ramp in violation of Sections 303.2 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.
- (x) The Property has an accessible ramp leading from the accessible parking space to the accessible entrances with a slope exceeding 1:12 in violation of Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (xi) The accessible ramp side flares have a slope in excess of 1:10 in violation of Section 406.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (xii) Defendants fail to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.

## **RESTROOMS**

- (i) The restroom lacks signage in compliance with Sections 216.8 and 703 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to locate accessible restroom facilities.
- (ii) The door exiting the restroom lacks a proper minimum maneuvering clearance, due to the proximity of the door hardware to the adjacent sink, in violation of Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- (iii) The restroom door swings into the clear floor space or space required by fixtures in the restrooms in violation of Section 603.2.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- (iv) The lavatories and/or sinks in the restrooms have exposed pipes and surfaces and are not insulated or configured to protect against contact in violation of Section 606.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

36. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at Super Mercado and the Property.

37. Plaintiff requires an inspection of Super Mercado and the Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at Super Mercado and the Property in violation of the ADA.

38. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations

alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

39. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to Super Mercado and the Property into compliance with the ADA.

40. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at Super Mercado and the Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

41. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at Super Mercado and the Property is readily achievable because Defendants, SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC, have the financial resources to make the necessary modifications as the Market value of the Property is listed as \$783,941.00 on the property appraiser's web site.

42. Upon information and good faith belief, Super Mercado and the Property have been altered since 2010.

43. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

44. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendants, SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC, are required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at Super Mercado and the Property, including those alleged herein.

45. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

46. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendants, SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC.

47. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendants, SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

48. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendants, SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC, to modify Super Mercado and the Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (a) That the Court find Defendant, SHORQ STAR, INC., in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (b) That the Court find Defendant, ANTHEM PROP, LLC, in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (c) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC, from continuing their discriminatory practices;
- (d) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendants, SHORQ STAR, INC. and ANTHEM PROP, LLC, to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the subject Super Mercado and the Property to make it readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;

- (e) That the Court award Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and
- (f) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: January 23, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Douglas S. Schapiro

Douglas S. Schapiro, Esq.

*Attorney-in-Charge for Plaintiff*

Southern District of Texas ID No. 3182479

The Schapiro Law Group, P.L

7301-A W. Palmetto Park Rd., #100A

Boca Raton, FL 33433

Tel: (561) 807-7388

Email: [schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com](mailto:schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com)